## Minutes of the Meeting of the World Bridge Federation Laws Committee Paris, 28<sup>th</sup> October 2001.

- Present: T. Kooijman, Chairman
  - R. Cohen, Vice-Chairman
  - G. Endicott, Secretary
  - J. Gerard
  - J. Polisner
  - A. Riccardi
  - W. Schoder
  - D. Morse attended briefly.

Guests: R. Colker

- H. De Wael
- A. Wildawsky

Apologies for absence: C. Martel, Vice-Chairman; C. Cabanne, C. Dadoun, S. Ghose.

- 1. The Chairman welcomed all present to the first meeting in Paris,2001, of the committee.
- 2. As a matter arising from the minutes of 30<sup>th</sup> August 2000, item 5, the Chief Tournament Director, Mr. Schoder, enquired as to the intention of the committee that irrationality is to be judged by the class of player involved. The committee confirmed this is so since the ratification of those minutes. It was added that the assessment of what is 'irrational' in this respect is a matter for Directors and Appeals Committees.
- 3. The committee deferred to its next meeting consideration of a proposal submitted by Mr. Robert Wolff.
- 4. Consideration was given to Law 70 -Contested Claims. The Chairman drew attention to the matter of a claim in Maastricht (see minutes of September 4<sup>th</sup>, 2000. Item 1). He, like the Chairman of that appeals committee, had been uncomfortable with the outcome, even if the appeals committee had applied its bridge judgement correctly to the laws as they are. Mr. Polisner considered that the only true reason for the annulment of any play subsequent to a claim is that declarer must not be allowed to recognize and remedy a flaw in his statement. Mr. Cohen saw a possibility that one could change the law to allow an option of calling the Director or playing out the hand. The subject was referred to the WBF Laws Drafting Subcommittee.
- 5. The committee received the final report of the Working Party on the Drafting of the World Bridge Federation Code of Laws for Bridge played Electronically ('Online Bridge'). The Chairman recited the procedure that the Working Group had adopted. It was noted that further suggestions had reached the Secretary after the deadline for submissions. It was agreed that for the time being these laws should be

reviewed annually and that the suggestions in question should be examined in the coming year. The Laws as presented to the committee were approved for submission to the WBF Executive Council with an invitation that it agree to ratify the Code and to authorize its promulgation worldwide. The Laws Committee also believed that the Executive Council would wish to determine the status of these laws. When distributing the new Code the Laws Committee proposes to invite Game Providers to send their further comments after obtaining experience in their operation.

Mr. Riccardi recorded a suggestion that many of the problems of the online game could be resolved if the software did not disclose a player's call or play to his partner until the LHO has made his call or play.

6. There was a discussion concerning the situation under Law 15C when the correct pair is seated and one of them makes a call for which no bridge reason can be perceived. It was agreed that such action is not acceptable and a Director who forms the opinion that there is no demonstrable bridge reason for a call by the incoming pair is authorized to treat this as a violation of Law 74A2.

[Secretary's note: the committee was aware of debate concerning a pair who might open 7NT when substituted at the table for an incorrect pair, with the implication that the purpose was to avoid playing the board.]

The Secretary stated his view that the law can act unfairly to the side that remains seated when it requires them to repeat the same calls against different opponents. The committee referred this question to the Laws Drafting Subcommittee.

7. It was agreed that when declarer calls for a card from dummy that is a revoke card, dummy may enquire of declarer concerning his possible revoke under Law 42B1.

[Secretary's note: the above is amended wording as agreed in the meeting of 30<sup>th</sup> October; it makes it clear that a dummy who has lost his rights is not barred from making such an enquiry in relation to declarer's play from dummy.]

- 8. Consideration was given to the experience of the operation of screen procedures. The Chairman offered a thought that when North pushes the tray through the screen bearing an irregular call by East this should constitute acceptance of East's call provided that it is not inadmissible. The Chief Tournament Director was invited to submit a draft that would meet his objections to some present regulations and which could be either incorporated in the laws or recommended to regulating authorities.
- 9. A paper on psychic action prepared by the Secretary was referred to the Systems Committee.
- 10. It was agreed that when a concession is made by a defender of a number of tricks, thereby claiming the complement of the remaining tricks, if the defender's partner immediately objects to the concession, under Law 68B

no concession has occurred and by the same token neither has any claim been made. After the Director has been summoned play continues and Law 16 may apply.

11. The committee discussed the status of spectators and the requirements of the laws in relation to them. The Chairman felt that a spectator was only a spectator when observing the play and that he ceased to be a spectator when he was no longer doing so. Other members of the committee were of the opinion that a spectator had responsibilities that continued after he was no longer observing the play. (The Secretary had drawn attention to the regulation in force at the current Championships.) It was suggested "spectators should not count" - i.e. that they should not be involved actively in a tournament. Mr. Riccardi offered a suggestion that where a spectator draws attention to an irregularity there should be an adjustment for one side only so that a score may be reduced but no trick awarded to a side in a manner to increase its score. The subject was remitted for the consideration of the Laws Review Subcommittee.

The committee then adjourned. It was agreed to meet again in the afternoon of Tuesday, 30<sup>th</sup> October 2001.